



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/731,242	12/09/2003	Brian Jones	60001.296US01	4899
27488	7590	08/28/2008		
MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT)				
P.O. BOX 2903				
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903				
EXAMINER				
TSUL, WILSON W				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2178				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/28/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/731,242

Applicant(s)

JONES ET AL.

Examiner

WILSON TSUI

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 July 2008.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 6-12, 14 and 16-22 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 6-12, 14 and 16-22 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S5108)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20080723
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This final action is based on the amendment filed on: 06/16/08, and IDS filed on: 07/23/08.
2. Claims 1, 10, and 18 are amended. Claims 2-5, 13, and 15 are cancelled. Claims 1, 10, and 18 are independent claims. Claims 1, 6-12, 14, and 16-22 are pending.
3. The rejection with respect to claims 10, 12, 14, and 16-21 is withdrawn, in view of applicant's amendment.
4. Claims 1, 4, 6-8 remain rejected, and claims 10, 12, 14, and 16-21 are now currently rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Altamura et al in view of Sun Micro, and further in view of Eisenberg.
5. Claim 9 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Altamura et al, Sun Micro, Eisenberg, and further view of Pavlov.
6. Claims 11 and 22 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Altamura et al, Sun Micro, Eisenberg, Klink et al, and further in view of Pavlov.

Information Disclosure Statement

7. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 07/23/08 is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1, 6-8 remain rejected, and claims 10, 12, 14, and 16-21 are currently rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Altamura et al (IJDR, published: November 7, 2000, pages 6-12) in view of Sun Micro ("Star Office XML File Format Working Draft", pages 19, 48, 49, 51, 54-58, 89, 142, and 234, published: January 2001), and further in view of Eisenberg (XML.com, published, June 8, 2001, pages 1a and 1).

With regards to claim 1, Altamura et al teaches a method comprising:

- *Determining properties corresponding to a mini-document that relates to at least one section of an application document, the mini-document includes a body portion:* (Fig. 3, P6-5: whereas, layout analysis is performed to determine the properties for each block in a document (where each block relates to a segment of a document image, and thus represents a mini-document of the entire application document)). ... wherein the mini-document includes at least one member of a group comprising a header (P9-3, whereas, a mini-document is recognized to be a header (labeled as 'running-header'). Additionally, the mini-

document has a **body** section, the body section comprises text such as the title of a header, as shown enclosed between the '<running-header>' and '</running-header>' markup, in P9-3).

- *Mapping the properties of the mini-document into a markup language element:* (P9-3: whereas, the properties of the mini-document, such as a running-header, is mapped into an element (labeled 'ID'), and assigned an ID value such as 'id0').
- *Storing the properties of the mini-document in the markup language document:* (P8-1 and P9-3: whereas, the properties are stored in a DTD data file).
- *Validating the markup language document in accordance with a schema having definitions for the mini-document, wherein the definitions for the mini-document include a definition for headers, and a definition for a mini-document type* (P7-10: whereas, the markup language document is validated according to a DTD/schema to conform to a set of logical document structure rules).

However, Altamura et al does not expressly teach wherein the mapping properties includes: *setting an option element in the mini-document markup language element, wherein the option element includes at least one member of a group comprising: a header value and a footer value, setting a type attribute in the mini-document markup language element, wherein the type attribute includes a value that indicates an occurrence pattern of the body of the mini-document within the application document; and wherein upon rendering the markup language document, the type attribute causes the body portion of the mini-document to be repeated in the application in accordance with the occurrence pattern, wherein the value is at least one member of a group*

comprising: an odd page value and an even page value, setting page size properties of the application document in the section properties of the application document, wherein the page size properties includes a size value of the page, and setting a margin properties of the application document in the section properties of the application document, wherein the margin properties include a top margin value, a bottom margin value, a left margin value, a right margin value and a position value of the location of the mini-document within the section of the application document; and wherein the definition for the mini document includes a definition for a footers, a definition for a context free chunk, a definition for a paragraph element, a definition for a table element

Sun Micro teaches wherein mapping the properties of the mini-document markup language element that is stored with each of the markup language section properties of the application document, wherein mapping the properties includes: setting an option element in the mini-document markup language element, wherein the option element

(pages 48 and 49: whereas section properties of an application/word-processing document is set through the use of a master page style element, and also page master element) *includes at least one member of a group comprising: a header value and a footer value* (pages 54-58: whereas the option element includes a header and a footer value), wherein upon rendering the markup language document, *wherein the type attribute includes a value that indicates an occurrence pattern of the body of the mini-document within the application document; (page 89, whereas, a horizontal type attribute corresponds to an occurrence pattern of a mini-document/frame), setting page size properties of the application document in the section properties of the application*

document, wherein the page size properties includes a size value of the page (page 49), and setting a margin properties of the application document in the section properties of the application document, wherein the margin properties include a top margin value, a bottom margin value, a left margin value, a right margin value (page 51) and a position value of the location of the mini-document within the section of the application document (page 89, whereas, a horizontal type attribute corresponds to an occurrence pattern of a mini-document/frame), wherein mapping includes mapping the properties into at least one member of a group comprising: a context free chunk element (whereas, properties of an application word processing document are analyzed to determine the properties of different sections including table element properties (page 9: whereas, an application word processing document gets analyzed, such that the properties are stored in XML format, and page 234, wherein table properties of a word document, include table elements to describe a particular table in an application document), and including paragraph element (page 51: whereas margins are part of paragraph formatting properties). Additionally, as explained in page 142, whereas a footnote body includes a context free chunk element by implementing inline data.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Altamura et al's method for determining and defining properties corresponding to a mini-document, to have further included and defined a mapping type attribute that corresponds to an occurrence pattern, and mapping the properties into a context free chunk element. The combination of Altamura et al and Sun

Micro would have allowed Altamura et al to have implemented an "open standard for office documents" (Sun Micro, page 19).

However, Altamura et al and Sun Micro do not expressly teach *the type attribute causes the body portion of the mini-document to be repeated in the application in accordance with the occurrence pattern, and wherein the value is at least one member of a group comprising: an odd page value and an even page value* .

Yet, Eisenberg teaches wherein the type attribute *causes* a document type *to be repeated in the application document in accordance with the occurrence pattern indicated by the type attribute (whether pages correspond to even, or odd number pages of a document (P1-4), as well as a first page (P1-2: whereas, a cover page is a sequence of one page).*

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Altamura et al's type attribute for whether a document (such as a mini-document comprising a body) occurs on a first, even, or odd pages as taught by Eisenberg. The combination of Altamura et al, Sun Micro, and Eisenberg would have allowed Altamura et al's system to have "specified the order (of pages) when it was the time to generate a sequence of pages" (Eisenberg, P1-1), and to also have optimally described the occurrence of a sub/mini-document, should the sub/mini-document be common among a set of pages in an application document.

With regards to claim 6, which depends on claim 1, Altamura et al teaches a method wherein:

- *Determining the properties corresponding to an additional mini-document that relates to at least one section of the application document:* (Fig. 3, p6-5: whereas, layout analysis is performed to determine one or more additional mini documents/blocks that have like properties in a document).
- *Mapping the properties of the additional mini-document into a markup language element,* an attribute and a value: (P9-3: whereas, the properties of the additional mini-document, such as a running-header, is mapped into an element (labeled 'ID'), and assigned an ID value such as 'id0' for one type of mini-document, and 'id4' for another type of mini document).
- *Storing the properties of the mini-document in the markup language document:* (P8-1 and P9-3: whereas, the properties are stored in a DTD data file).

Additionally, Sun Micro teaches wherein *mapping includes mapping the properties into at least one member of a group comprising: a table element*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Altamura et al's method for determining properties corresponding to an additional mini-document, to have further included determining the properties comprise at least one of a table element, as taught by Sun Micro. The combination of Altamura et al, Sun Micro, and Eisenberg would have allowed Altamura et al to have implemented an "open standard for office documents" (Sun Micro, page 19).

With regards to claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, Altamura et al teaches a method comprising:

- *Determining whether properties associated with all mini-documents of the application document have been stored in the markup language document; and processing further mini-documents when the properties associated with all mini-documents have not been stored in the markup language document* (P7-9: whereas, the application document is translated into HTML/XML formats by aggregating all textual, graphical, layout and logical information extracted in the document analysis and understanding process).

With regards to claim 8, which is dependent on claim 1, Altamura et al teaches a method wherein *the properties of the mini-document stored in the markup language document* (in claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale), *are understood by an application that understands the markup language when the mini-document is not native to the application* (P7-10, Fig. 5: whereas, xml documents can be sent to a client browser that does not have the mini-document native to the application, through the help of a validating parser using an agreed schema of information exchange (DTD) + XML)).

With regards to claim 10, Altamura et al teaches a computer readable medium comprising:

- *Determining properties relating to a mini-document, wherein the mini-document includes a body portion having text* (similar to claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale) *used within a word processing document* (P9-4: whereas, the

image document is word processed since OCR technology is used to extract words from the image, and thus represents a word processing document as well).

- *Determining whether the mini-document is at least one member of a group comprising a header* (P9-3, whereas, a mini-document is recognized to be a header (labeled as 'running-header').
- *Writing the properties into at least one of a markup language element, an attribute, and a value, similarly in claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.*
- *Storing the properties in the markup language document such that the headers of the word-processing document are substantially maintained when the markup language document is parsed by an application* (P8-1 and P9-3: whereas, the properties are stored in a DTD data file).

However, Altamura et al does not expressly teach writing the properties into *each of the section properties markup language elements associated with the word processing document, wherein writing the properties includes: writing an option element in the mini-document markup language element, wherein the option element includes at least one member of a group comprising: a header value and a footer value, setting a type attribute, wherein the type attribute includes a value that indicates an occurrence pattern of the body of the mini-document in the application document wherein upon rendering the markup language document, the type attribute causes the body portion of the mini-document to be repeated in the application in accordance with the occurrence*

pattern, and setting a margin properties of the application document in the section properties of the application document, wherein the margin properties include a numerical position value of the location of the min-document within the section of the word-processing document; storing the properties in the markup language document such that the headers and footers of the word-processing document are substantially maintained when the markup language document is parsed by an application.

Altamura, Sun Micro, and Eisenberg similarly teach writing the properties into each of the section properties markup language elements associated with the word processing document, wherein writing the properties includes: writing an option element in the mini-document markup language element, wherein the option element includes at least one member of a group comprising: a header value and a footer value, setting a type attribute, wherein the type attribute includes a value that indicates an occurrence pattern of the body of the mini-document in the application document wherein upon rendering the markup language document, the type attribute causes the body portion of the mini-document to be repeated in the application in accordance with the occurrence pattern, and setting a margin properties of the application document in the section properties of the application document, wherein the margin properties include a numerical position value of the location of the min-document within the section of the word-processing document; storing the properties in the markup language document such that the headers and footers of the word-processing document are substantially maintained when the markup language document is parsed by an application.(as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1), and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 12, which depends on claim 10, Altamura et al teaches a computer readable medium for performing a method similar to claim 8, and is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 14, which depends on claim 10, Altamura et al teaches a method for a *mini-document occurring in a specified section of the word processing document* (in claim 10, and is rejected under the same rationale), and a *type attribute*, similarly in claim 3, and is rejected under the same rationale. However, Altamura et al does not expressly teach the type attribute corresponding to *whether* the mini-document occurs on at least one member of a group comprising: *odd pages of a specified section of the application document, or even pages of the application document*. Yet, Altamura et al, Sun Micro, and Eisenberg teaches the *attributes* for whether the mini document corresponds to *whether the mini-document occurs on at least one member of a group comprising odd pages of the specified section of the application document, or even pages of the specified section of the application document*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 10, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 16, which depends on claim 13, Altamura et al teaches a computer readable medium comprises:

- *Determining properties corresponding to an additional mini-document that relates to at least one section* (similarly in claim 6, and is rejected under the same rationale), *of a word processing document* (in claim 10, and is rejected under the same rationale).

- *Mapping the properties of the additional mini-document into at least one of a markup language element, an attribute, and a value; and storing the properties of the additional mini-document in the markup language document: (as similarly taught in claim 6, and is rejected under the same rationale).*

Additionally, Altamura and Sun micro teach *wherein the mapping includes mapping the properties into at least one member of a group comprising: a table element, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 10, and is rejected under the same rationale.*

With regards to claim 17, which depends on claim 13, Altamura et al teaches a computer readable medium for performing a method similar to claim 7, and is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 18, Altamura et al, Sun Micro, and Eisenberg teaches a system a processor and memory associated with computer-executable instructions configured to :

- *Determine properties relating to a mini-document included in at least one section of an application document, wherein the mini-document includes a body portion having text; determine whether the mini-document is at least one member of a group comprising: a header and a footer; map the properties into a markup language element that is stored with markup language section properties of the sections of the application document, wherein mapping the properties includes setting an option element in the mini-document markup language element, wherein the option element includes at least one member of a group comprising:*

a header value and a footer value, setting a type attribute, wherein the type attribute, includes a value that indicates an occurrence pattern of the body of the mini-document within the application document, wherein upon rendering the markup language document, the type attribute causes the body portion of the mini-document to be repeated in the application in accordance with the occurrence pattern, setting a margin properties of the application document in the section properties of the application document, wherein the margin properties include a position value of the location of the mini-document within the section of the application document, and store the properties in the markup language section properties of the application document; and a validation engine configured to validate the markup language document (as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1), and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 19, which depends on claim 18, Altamura et al teaches a system performing a method similar to claim 6, and is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 20, which depends on claim 18, Altamura et al teaches a system performing a method similar to claim 7, and is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 21, which depends on claim 18, Altamura et al teaches a system wherein *the properties of the mini-document stored in the markup language document are understood by an additional application that understands the markup*

language when the mini-document is not native to the additional application (P7-10, Fig. 5: whereas, xml documents can be sent to a additional application (client browser) that does not have the mini-document native to the additional application, through the help of a validating parser using an agreed schema of information exchange (DTD) + XML)).

9. Claim 9 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Altamura et al (IJDAR, published: November 7, 2000, pages 6-12), Sun Micro ("Star Office XML File Format Working Draft", pages 19, 48, 49, 51, 54-58, 89, 142, and 234, published: January 2001), Eisenberg (XML.com, published, June 8, 2001, pages 1a and 1), and further view of Pavlov (US Patent: 6,725,426 B1, published: Apr. 20, 2004, filed: Mar. 17, 2000).

With regards to claim 9, which is dependent on claim 1, Altamura et al teaches a method for wherein *the markup language document is manipulated* on a client station to *substantially reproduce the mini-document of the application document notwithstanding the presence of an application that generated the markup language document* (Section 6.2, Fig. 5: whereas, the properties stored in the markup document, are understood by a client web browser to reproduce the document without using WISDOM++). However Altamura et al does not teach the markup language document is *manipulated on a server* to reproduce the mini-document.

Pavlov teaches a markup language document is *manipulated on a server to reproduce the mini-document* (column 3, lines 59-65: whereas, a system capable of

retrieving XML content is manipulated by a server to reproduce a document for a particular device).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Altamura et al's mini-document reproduction system to be reproduced on a server system as taught by Pavlov. The combination of Altamura et al, Sun Micro, Eisenberg, and Pavlov would have allowed Altamura et al's system to have "stored content in XML format instead of word processing documents" (Pavlov, column 1, lines 34-39).

10. Claims 11 and 22 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Altamura et al (JDAR, published: November 7, 2000, pages 6-12), Sun Micro ("Star Office XML File Format Working Draft", pages 19, 48, 49, 51, 54-58, 89, 142, and 234, published: January 2001), Eisenberg (XML.com, published, June 8, 2001, pages 1a and 1), , and further in view of Pavlov (US Patent: 6,725,426 B1, published: Apr. 20, 2004, filed: Mar. 17, 2000).

With regards to claim 11, which depends on claim 10, Altamura et al a computer readable medium comprising:

- *A word processing document*, similarly, in claim 10, and is rejected under the same rationale.
- *The markup language document is manipulated on a client to substantially reproduce the mini-document of the word-processing document notwithstanding the presence of an application that generated the markup language document* (Section 6.2, Fig. 5: whereas, the properties stored in the markup document, are

understood by a client web browser to reproduce the document without using WISDOM++). However Altamura et al does not teach the markup language document is *manipulated on a server to reproduce the mini-document*.

However, Altamura et al does not teach the markup language document is *manipulated on a server to reproduce the mini-document*.

Pavlov teaches a markup language document is *manipulated on a server to reproduce the mini-document* (column 3, lines 59-65: whereas, a system capable of retrieving XML content is manipulated by a server to reproduce a document for a particular device).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Altamura et al's mini-document reproduction system to be reproduced on a server system as taught by Pavlov. The combination of Altamura et al, Sun Micro, Eisenberg, and Pavlov would have allowed Altamura et al's system to have "stored content in XML format instead of word processing documents" (Pavlov, column 1, lines 34-39).

With regards to claim 22, which depends on claim 18, Altamura et al teaches a system performing a method similar to claim 9, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments filed 06/16/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

12. The applicant is respectfully directed to the rejection for claim 1, as to how the additional teachings of Sun Micro (additional NPL pages included with this rejection) is used in combination with Altamura et al and Eisenburg to teach the amended limitations of claim 1.

13. Furthermore, the examiner respectfully points out and suggests that the writing of properties appear to just define a data structure and does not substantially add value to expedite the application. The examiner would like to recommend the applicant focus on the functional aspects of the invention (i.e.: the steps to generate the data structure), rather than the non-functional aspects of writing values to describe a set of data.

14. With regards to applicant's arguments with respect to claims 10, and 18, the applicant's amendments to the claims have changed the scope of the implementation of footers for the word processing document, and thus, Klink et al is withdrawn, and the examiner respectfully directs the applicant to the rejections above, as to how Sun Micro still teaches the amended claim limitations.

15. With regards to the dependent claims being allowable, since the claims depend on an allowable independent claim; is not persuasive since the independent claims have been shown/explained to be rejected.

Conclusion

16. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to WILSON TSUI whose telephone number is (571)272-7596. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/CESAR B PAULA/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178

/Wilson Tsui/
Patent Examiner
Art Unit: 2178
Aug. 13, 2008